UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN SOUTHERN DIVISION

IN RE:

JOSEPH BRECKOW ELIZABETH BRECKOW,

Debtor.

CY COURT CHIGAN
N
Case No. 05-40402
Chapter 7

Judge Thomas J. Tucker

ORDER DENYING DEBTORS' "APPLICATION TO CONVERT FROM CHAPTER 7 TO CHAPTER 13 PURSUANT TO BANKRUPTCY CODE 706(a)(c)

This case is before the Court on a motion filed on June 7, 2005 by Debtors entitled "Application to Convert from Chapter 7 to Chapter 13 Pursuant to Bankruptcy Code 706(a)(c)."

On July 20, 2005, Debtors filed a "Certificate of No Response," indicating that no one had timely objected to the motion. Upon consideration, however, the Court must deny the motion.

Debtors filed this case under Chapter 13 on January 6, 2005. Debtors later voluntarily converted the case to Chapter 7 under 11 U.S.C. § 1307(a). The order of conversion was filed February 17, 2005. Debtors now seek to convert the case back to Chapter 13.

As this Court previously held in another case, however, 11 U.S.C. § 706(a) precludes such a conversion to Chapter 13, because this case was previously converted from Chapter 13 to Chapter 7 under § 1307. See In re Jerry Gaines and Gloria Briggs, Case No. 04-63830 (bench opinion, February 24, 2005)(copy of transcript attached); see also In re Banks, 252 B.R. 399 (Bankr. E.D. Mich. 2000)(Rhodes, J.).

Accordingly, Debtors' "Application to Convert from Chapter 7 to Chapter 13 Pursuant to Bankruptcy Code 706(a)(c)," filed June 7, 2005, is denied.

Date: 7-27-05

Thomas J. Tucker

United States Bankruptcy Judge

cc: Neal J. Brand

Basil Simon, Trustee

A TRUE COPY

CLERK, U.S. BANKRUPTCY COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN

2

Y: W W COORDINATE WILL BE DEPUTY CLERI

DATE: JUL 2 7 2005

UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN SOUTHERN DIVISION

In the matter of:

JERRY GAINES and GLORIA Case No. 04-63830

BRIGGS,

Detroit, Michigan Thursday, February 24, 2005

Debtors

Judge Tucker

EXCERPT OF HEARING: RULING OF THE COURT ON MOTION TO RECONVERT CASE FROM CHAPTER 7 BACK TO CHAPTER 13

BEFORE THE HONORABLE THOMAS J. TUCKER, BANKRUPTCY JUDGE

TRANSCRIPT ORDERED BY: JUDGE THOMAS J. TUCKER

APPEARANCES:

For the Debtors:

Law Offices of James P. Frego

BY: TANYA WILLIAMS

23843 Joy Road

Dearborn Heights, MI 48127

For the trustee:

Allard & Fish

BY: TIMOTHY G. GRAVES 535 Griswold, Suite 2600

Detroit, MI 48226

For Ameriquest:

Potsevo & Associates BY: JONATHAN BINKELMAN 811 South Blvd., Suite 100 Rochester Hills, MI 48307

Recorded by:

Shelley J. Grasel

211 W. Fort Street, Suite 1900

Detroit, MI_48226

Transcribed by:

Lynn L. Simmons 8284 Caribou Trail

Clarkston, MI 48348-4514

248-922-1587

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXCERPT OF PROCEEDINGS - Thursday, February 24, 2005 MOTION TO RECONVERT CASE FROM CHAPTER 7 BACK TO CHAPTER 13	3

Detroit, Michigan Thursday, February 24, 2005 Morning Session

* * *

(At about 10:08 A.M. - excerpt begins.)

THE COURT: The first issue that I think the Court confronts in considering this motion is whether the Court may allow reconversion. as it's been called in the motion. What it is is whether the Court may allow conversion by the Debtor, Mr. Gaines, to Chapter 13 from Chapter 7 when there was previously a conversion of Mr. Gaines' Chapter 13 case to Chapter 7 under Section 1307 of the Code.

Under 706(a) of the Bankruptcy Code the Debtor, Mr. Gaines, does not in this circumstance have a right to convert the case voluntarily to Chapter 13 because the exception in Section 706(a) applies. That is, the case has been converted under Section 1307 previously. Therefore the right, whether it's an automatic right or a right subject to objections based on bad faith or other grounds, the cases are a little -- are -- differ on that question. But whichever it is under 706(a), that right does not apply here because this case was previously converted, voluntarily I might add, by the Debtor, Mr. Gaines, from Chapter 13 to Chapter 7, where it now rests.

In my view the answer to this first issue, first question is that the Court does not have the authority or --

to, under the Bankruptcy Code, under Section 105(a), under Section 706(a), or under any other section of the Code to permit conversion of this case back to Chapter 13 on the Debtor's voluntary request, and therefore the motion, styled a motion of reconversion, et cetera, must be denied for that reason.

I want to explain briefly why I come to this conclusion. First, I have read the decision of this court through Judge Rhodes in the <u>Banks</u> case, which did hold consistent with the ruling that I'm making today, that in these circumstances reconversion or conversion back to Chapter 13 is not permitted. The <u>Banks</u> case, for the record, is *In* re: <u>Banks</u>, 252 B.R. 399, a decision of the Bankruptcy Court of this district from 2000.

I -- I would -- while I would agree with the result in <u>Banks</u>, I would add a couple points to the reasoning of the court in <u>Banks</u>, and depart possibly somewhat from the reasoning of the court in <u>Banks</u>. Except as -- as indicated, I do agree with the reasoning and holding of the court in <u>Banks</u>.

First, I don't -- I don't find Section 706(a) or 706(d) to be ambiguous on this question before the Court today at all. 706(a) is, in my view, unambiguous in -- to the extent that it does not permit conversion in this circumstance because there has been previously a conversion under Section 1307.

13 -- Section 706(d) is not ambiguous in this context because 706(d) does not authorize conversion. It merely creates a limitation on conversion, when conversion otherwise is permissible. One of the limitations of 706(d) is that a debtor in Chapter 7 may not be converted to Chapter 13 without requesting it; that is, involuntarily against the debtor's wishes. That's consistent with the general Bankruptcy Code policy that Chapter 13 is a voluntary provision and debtors may not be forced into it against their will. And there is no other provision in the Bankruptcy Code that authorizes conversion from a Chapter 7 to a Chapter 13 in this circumstance.

I view that fact and the fact that Section 706 does not authorize conversion in this circumstance as indicative of congressional intent that there be no such right to convert and that there be no such conversion permitted. Part of my reasoning for that is -- is by contrasting the wording of Section 706, in particular 706(a), with the wording of Section 707(a) and Section 1307(a). Section 1307(a) is the provision that allows a debtor to voluntarily convert a case from Chapter 13 to Chapter 7 at any time.

So that the first sentence of 1307(a) is virtually identical in structure to the first sentence of Section 706(a) except that it does not contain, nor does 1307(a) or any other provision of the Code contain any limitation on the Chapter 13

debtor's right to convert that -- that limits or excludes the situation where the case had been previously converted under another section of the Code from a different chapter of the Code.

So for example, if a debtor began in Chapter 7, converted to Chapter 13, and then under 1307(a) sought to voluntarily convert back to Chapter 7, 1307(a) would permit that, notwithstanding the prior conversion from 7 to 13. That contrast between the wording of 1307(a) and the wording of 706(a), which does contain such a limitation, in my view clearly indicates congressional intent that conversion under 706(a) not be permitted when there has been a prior conversion under 1307, at least a conversion to Chapter 13 here.

The -- my reference to Section 706(a) is that -simply to further contrast. In that section Congress
permitted a debtor, among others, after notice and hearing and
for cause, to voluntarily dismiss a -- dismiss a Chapter 7
case and does not limit that -- that right to seek voluntary
dismissal to -- by excluding cases -- Chapter 7 cases from
dismissal voluntarily when they -- on the grounds that they've
been previously converted from another chapter. These
provisions, especially the contrast of 1307(a) in my view
indicate congressional intent, as I said, to prohibit
conversion in this circumstance.

That, combined with the fact that no provision in

the Code authorizes conversion in the circumstance to Chapter 13 persuades me that I am not permitted -- the Court is not permitted to authorize and grant conversion in this circumstance. Section 105(a) does not give the Court that authority. In my view Section 105(a) -- while Section 105(a) does say that the court may issue any order, process or judgment necessary or appropriate to carry out provisions of this title, there is no provision of this title, that is of the Bankruptcy Code, Title 11, that would authorize conversion in this circumstance, and therefore 105(a) does not apply.

Furthermore, 105(a) does not authorize conversion here because that would be contrary to what I view as congressional intent that conversion in this setting to Chapter 13 not be permitted.

So for those reasons, I must and will deny the Debtor's motion.

I would note, although not expressing any opinion on it at this point or making any decision on the merits of this argument, that if conversion in this circumstance were discretionary or could be committed -- permitted for cause or based on some other standard, bad faith -- there would be a substantial question about bad faith and whether bad faith, one, would be an adequate ground for preventing conversion, or two, whether bad faith exists here. That does require an inquiry into the totality of the circumstances, might require

an evidentiary hearing in this -- based on the arguments here, but in my view it's not necessary to have such an evidentiary hearing or decide that -- that issue or series of issues because of my ruling on the right to convert and the authority of the Court to convert.

So for those reasons the motion will be denied. I will ask the trustee to prepare an order that says that for the reasons stated by the Court on the record at the conclusion of this hearing the motion is denied.

ALL PARTIES: Thank you, your Honor.

(At about 10:17 A.M. - hearing concluded.)

I certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript of the proceedings held in the above-entitled matter.

Simmons,

Transcriber

DATED: <u>April 15, 2005</u>

6

7

9

10

11